

Patent
Attorney Docket: AUS920010460US1
(IBM/0017)

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for conducting a telephone interview regarding the issues in the pending office action. All of the issues discussed during the interview are summarized in the remarks below.

Claims 38-44 stand allowed. Applicant thanks the Examiner for finding these claims to be allowable. Please consider the following remarks concerning the remaining claims.

Claims 6 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for certain informalities. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 12 to correct these informalities. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 17-20, 26-28, 31, 33-35 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0,137,489 of Dutta, *et al.* in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0,014,464 of Takatori, *et al.* Dutta discloses a wireless telephone or other portable device that includes telecommunications circuitry and further having a slave device coupled to the telecommunications circuitry of the wireless telephone. (Dutta, Abstract). The slave device is operable 1) to receive a radio signal notification from a master device affixed to a vehicle and 2) to trigger the telecommunications circuitry to transmit a wireless carrier system notification of an event, such as a deployment of an airbag. *Id.*

Takatori discloses a basic configuration and method for use in a wireless LAN system that allows each slave communication device to perform wireless telephone communication by itself through a wireless telephone system without relaying through a master communication device while a single wireless telephone line is used. (Takatori, Abstract). Each slave device holds identifying information, such as IP or MAC addresses or the like, for identifying one another and each identifying information is registered in a memory. (Takatori, ¶ 42). The master communications device may determine the presence or absence of the reception of the slave ID by monitoring a signal received at the transmission reception station. (Takatori, ¶ 80).

Applicant claims, *inter alia*, receiving, at an on-board computer, a wireless identification

Patent
Attorney Docket: AUS920010460US1
(IBM/0017)

message from the mobile electronic device located within the automobile; storing, within the on-board computer, an address for the mobile electronic device and an address for each of one or more features within the mobile electronic device. (Claims 1, 17 and 26).

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 985 (CCPA 1974). All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art. *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385 (CCPA 1970).

Applicant respectfully asserts that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been presented for the claims, as amended, because the cited prior art fails to teach each and every limitation claimed by Applicant. Specifically, while the prior art does teach that the master computer registers an address for each slave device, the prior art does not teach that the master computer also registers addresses for one or more features within the slave device. Those portions of Takatori cited to suggest or teach that the addresses of one or more features are maintained instead merely teach that the addresses of the slave device, i.e., the IP or MAC address of each slave device, is maintained. (Takatori, ¶ 40, ¶ 80).

Therefore, because the cited prior art references fail to teach or suggest each and every element of independent claims 1, 17 and 26, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 17 and 26 as well as for all claims depending therefrom.

Claims 4, 7, 11, 13-15, 21-25, 30, 32, 36-37 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for finding these claims allowable if rewritten in independent form and including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

During the telephone interview, Applicant discussed the possibility of amending claims 1, 17 and 26 to include the limitations of the claim 4 and therefore have all claims found to be allowable. However, Applicant has decided not to include the limitations of claim 4 in the independent claims and, as discussed in the remarks above, believes the claims are in condition for allowance as they now stand amended. Therefore, in view of the remarks above concerning independent claims 1, 17

Patent
Attorney Docket: AUS920010460US1
(IBM/0017)

and 26 as amended, *supra*, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to dependent claims 4, 7, 11, 13-15, 21-25, 30, 32, 36-37.

Applicant respectfully asserts that all claims are now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowance be timely issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would expedite the examination of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the below signed attorney at the convenience of the Examiner. In the event there are additional charges in connection with the filing of this Response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the Deposit Account No. 50-0714/IBM-0017 of the firm of the below-signed attorney in the amount of any necessary fee.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank J. Campigotto
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 48,130
STREETS & STEELE
13831 Northwest Freeway, Suite 355
Houston, Texas 77040
(713) 939-9444